DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 612 EA 017 155

AUTHOR Bliss, James O.
TITLE School District Profiles: An Aid to Decision Making.
PUB DATE 3 Oct 83
NOTE 32p.; Transcription of speech given at the Annual Meeting of the Association of School Business Officials (Phoenix, AZ, October 2-6, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Databases; Educational Finance; Educational Trends; Enrollment Projections; Expenditure per Student; Information Dissemination; *School Business Officials; *School Districts; School District Spending; *School Statistics; *State Departments of Education; *State School District Relationship; Statistical Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Missouri School Profile System

ABSTRACT

The Missouri School Profile System is composed of six profiles drawn from pre-existing databases, with the data organized in a manner useful to school districts for comparison purposes and returned to school districts for their use. Use of such a system should reduce or eliminate the need for special school district studies of finance or pupil counts. Those interested in adapting the system for use in other states are advised: (1) rearrange existing data already being collected by the state education agency; (2) state averages and various comparisons should not contain individual school district data; (3) the system should cover at least a 3-year time span for trend analysis purposes; and (4) limit the system to the smallest possible number of data items. The purposes and data elements of Missouri's six profiles are explained in the document. The first and second profiles concern a comparison over time of the districts' receipts and expenditures; the third, relative transportation costs; the fourth, what students are doing after leaving school; the fifth, actual enrollment; and the sixth, staff salary, prior years' salary, and instructors' experience. (MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED248612

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James O. Bliss

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SCHOOL DISTRICT PROFILES: AN AID TO DECISION MAKING

JAMES O. BLISS
Jefferson City, MO

OCTOBER 3, 1983

TRANSCRIPTION OF SPEECH GIVEN AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BUSINESS OFFICIALS (PHOENIX, ARIZONA, OCTOBER 2-6, 1983).

EA 017 155

(Transcription of a speech made at the 69th Annual Meeting of the Association of School Business Officials, October 3, 1983)

How many times has a question come up in your district about the amount of money that your district is spending in comparison with spending for the same type of objects in other school districts? How many times has the question come up of the salaries in your district as compared to the salaries in similar districts in other parts of your state? How many times has the question come up of the changing enrollment patterns in your district as contrasted with similar size districts in other parts of the state? The answers to all these questions are contained in data that has been routinely submitted to your state education agency over the past fifty years. Why then is it necessary for the school district to survey its counterparts throughout the state to secure this information? In fact, it is a duplication of efforts already being done. Thus was born the school district profile idea in the State of Missouri. That is, make use of pre-existing data bases with no new collection of data and thus no new burden on any school district. Organize the data in a manner useful to school districts for comparison purposes and return it to school districts for their usage.

Key Concept No. 1 - Do not collect any new data, but merely rearrange existing data already being collected by the state education agency.

In order to be most useful to school districts, the districts themselves have to play a part in specifying what the common comparisons and common questions that occur that can be answered

EA 017 155

by comparing with other school districts. This project cannot be done in isolation merely at the state education agency level, but must involve the active participation of school district personnel in specifying the type of report they'd like to see. All of us, both at the local education agency level and at the state education agency level, seem to have a full set of working problems from day to day and very rarely, if ever, have a block of time left over from the daily grind of activities to throw whole-heartedly into a project of this magnitude. Thus, it was decided in the case of Missouri to invest a relatively small amount of money in contracting one of the "big ten" accounting firms to actually put together the concept of the Missouri Profile. This firm interviewed school districts for their data needs, researched the data bases within the Missouri Department of Education. Once the plan had its skeletal structure, it was debated back and forth, refined and indeed is being refined even to this day.

The Missouri Department of Education started on this course approximately four years ago and now has a history of several school profiles over the past four years. The outside consulting firm drew up the data base relationships, actually naming the various data processing files, but the programming itself was done by the staff of the Missouri Department of Education. In general, looking over the past 10 years, the Missouri Department of Education probably, if anything, uses outside consulting much less than any other state department of education, but in this particular instance, the investment has been felt to be extremely worthwhile.

One of the motivating factors on the part of the Department of Education was the fact that the School Finance Section was annually asked to meet with various school districts throughout the state to counsel them on financial problems, both those districts with negative-deficit balances and those districts experiencing financial difficulties of another sort. In preparing for these visits and in doing the homework for these visits, it was found that a certain repetitive pattern was established. That is, the Director of School Finance Section or one of the other personnel in the School Finance Section would research the district's financial capacity in terms of its assessed valuation, its tax levy, its state aid on the foundation formula, its participation in various federal aid and other financial revenues indigenous to the community.

Once it was determined that a certain pattern seemed to be necessary in the analysis of the financial program of almost any district, it was readily incorporated into the thinking on the school district profile. At the same time, the financial aspects cannot exist or make sense without relating them to student aspects; student counts, teacher counts, projected changes in student counts and so forth; so these were also incorporated into the school district profile.

Key Point No. 2 - The school district profile should reduce or eliminate the need for special school district studies of finance or pupil counts as these are reproduced with great accuracy and with great comparability in the school district profile system.

Another key concept and probably one that is very much different from a school district profile system in use in any

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

other state is this. The Missouri system publishes a master profile book that contains state averages for high school districts, such as AAA, AA, etc., five different sizes of school districts in terms of enrollment and four different wealth categories in terms of local assessed valuation. This booklet, however, does not contain any information on any individual school district. Instead the individual information is printed out and mailed solely and exclusively to that particular school district.

Thus, we avoid the embarrassment, the raising of questions or the problems associated with publishing information of districts side by side in some sort of comparitive fashion for the use of someone, perhaps a stranger, who would not have the sophistication to interpret differences in this information. On the other hand, if one or more school districts in a locale wish to publish their individual profiles, then they are, of course, free to do so. We feel that it is extremely important that the district have control over the release and the interpretation of the data for their particular school district.

Key Conept No. 3 - The school profile system, while including state averages and various comparisons, should not contain individual school district data identifiable with a particular school or building.

We have found now over the four years that we have been using the school profile system that its popularity and its actual usage with school board members, with the press, with the school community, with teachers' groups, has grown and grown every year. More and more persons are using this as their source of information and this is good because now we are all coming from the same point of reference and there are less arguments

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

about data than there used to be when many people were pulling from vastly different data bases.

School districts can demonstrate to their board of education the progress that is being made toward specific objectives and priorities of the school board in relationship to general state averages for similar size districts and similar wealth districts. One important feature of the Missouri School Profile System is a comparison, not only for the most recently ended fiscal year, but also for the two fiscal years preceding. Thus, a growth or decline is readily evidenced in the comparison of the district with other similarly situated districts over time.

Key Point No. 4 - The Profile System should cover at least a three year time span for trend analysis purposes.

One of the temptations that must be avoided on putting together a school district profile system is to include too many things. The Missouri School Profile System consists of only six profiles. Yes, I said only six. This is going to be extremely difficult, mainly for the state education agency who has a tendency and a predilection to inundate people with data simply because they have it. This is going to cause many arguments and much discussion in narrowing the display of data items to those few that can do the greatest good for school districts. Our consultants advised and we have come to appreciate the fact that if the data items are narrowed in their range considerably, that the document will be used to a much greater extent than if it was unwieldy, huge and incomprehensible to most users.

Do you have a forms control person working in your state

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

education agency, or if you're in a very large district, working for your district? If you have ever run up against one of these people - one of these "critters" - you'll find that you have to justify to great lengths each and every data item that you collect from your schools. We have a very strong, excellent lady in this position, Dr. Bertha McClaskey, who handles it in just the right manner; in a tough manner and yet with a good working relationship within the various divisions with the Missouri Department of Education. This same attitude prevailed when working on the School District Profile, that is, don't put data out simply because you have the data, have a very burning, pressing reason for including the data in the profile or don't include it at all!

Key Point No. 5 - Limit the School District Profile to the smallest number of data items that can possibly have any meaning for the school district in order to enhance its usage and understanding.

One thing that we will need to point out is the fact that although we have only six profiles in the district set, it will appear to you, the users, that we have many more profiles than this in the state profile. This is correct in the sense that if we have a profile for instance on expenditure per pupil in the district profile, this will, of necessity, be multiplied several times in the state profile. This is because the state profile will have this expenditure per pupil based on district size, based on district wealth, based on district classification such as AAA, AA, etc. So, although there are only six profiles in an individual districct printout, there will be approximately 20 profiles in the master state profile book.

As you can see on the first use, it will take a little bit of inservice training in order to be able to match up the school district individual profile with the state profile and make any sense out of a comparison between the two. We did not have any extensive inservice between the education agency and local school districts. As a matter of fact, the School Finance Section and the School Data Section, during their regular activities in the state, kind of "bootlegged" the inservicing on the usage of the profile system.

What happened was that a few districts became fairly expert in the comparison usage of the school profiles and began creating newspaper articles as a result of the profiles in their particular school district. This then was observed by readers of the newspapers, the surrounding school districts and then kind of grew like topsy and now several years later, approximately 80% of the superintendents and school district personnel are aware of and regularly use the school district profile system for their own purposes. If, in your state, you want a faster adoption, then it would be well to "key in" some specific workshops on the usage of your profile system.

Now let's take a look at a sample school district profile. The one that we have passed out consists of seven pages which are basically six profiles, plus a supplement. The first profile is a comparison over time of the receipts, expenditures, ending balances, and the percent ending balances are of total expenditures. The profile also contains the tax levies per $100 of assessed valuation, the assessed valuation per pupil, the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

equalized assessed valuation per pupil, the tax collection rate, and an effective yield thing that is based on the fact that Missouri does not assess at 100% of true value, but at considerably lesser percents and percents that vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. In any event, the main thrust of the first profile is to gauge the financial viability of the school district in terms of its ending fund balance and the trend line in that ending fund balance. The key measure on the ending fund balance would be the percent ending fund balances are of annual expenditures and to note that the percent relationship is declining or ascending or is perhaps mixed between funds.

One notable item that this uncovered in many districts was that the percent of ending balance in relationship to total expenditures in the Debt Service Fund was excessive. Nowhere in the literature or in the bond covenants does any bonding agency ever require more than one year's principal and interest to be on hand at the end of the fiscal year. Yet we found when we reviewed several of the individual school district profiles that many were above the 100% mark. In fact, we found one at 900 some odd percent, which meant that he could make interest and principal payments for nine years and reduce his tax levy to zero.

In Missouri, under our statutes, the Board of Education retains the right to increase or reduce the levy in Debt Service Fund to meet the annual obligations of the fund. In many cases the levy was set at the time that the bond issue was approved by the voters and set in knowledge of the assessed valuation at that time. Since bond issues are set to run over a course of 20 years, many of these assessed valuations have grown tremendously

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in that time and yet the levy has never been reduced in order to bring in a substantially level payment. This then accounts for the increase in Fund Balance. Illegally, the school districts in this particular instance have been using the Debt Service Fund's excess cash to enhance the school district's cash flow position over all, since Missouri school districts use one common bank account. Missouri has 546 districts and in analyzing this Debt Service item, we found that approximately 100 districts had balances in excess of 100%. Fifty-five districts had balances in excess of 200%. This year, we're working with these districts and counseling them to reduce these levies before they have a tax payer revolt and this information becomes public in their newspaper and in their community.

Missouri does not have any law concerning financially distressed districts or bankrupt districts. Instead, members of the School Finance Section staff work individually with such negative balance districts in counseling them to improve budget-making practices, improve financial accounting practices, improve financial reporting practices, and in various sessions with their school boards. One thing we have noticed as we've worked with the school profile system is that many districts were in some financial trouble; at one time as high as 80 some-odd school districts out of 546, approximately two years ago. This was kind of at the tail end of what we might call "good times."

Things have really tightened up in Missouri; the recent recession and the downtourn in state collections of sales tax and income tax as reflected in the Governor's cut at midyear of

state education funding. The schools really had to "suck it in," and contrary to expectations, we had fewer negative balance districts in 1981-82 than we did in 1980-81. Although our results are incomplete as far as analysis is concerned for 1982-83, we have fewer still negative balance districts than in 1981-82. I think that the conclusion that we can draw from this is that when districts and school boards have a perception of very difficult economic times, they become much more careful managers than when they are existing in so called "good times." Also, you must remember that the majority of school districts in Missouri are not subject to any kind of organized labor union activity and the school boards still retain the control over the compensation to individuals employed by the districts.

The tax levy on Profile I is of interest in that it may be matched with similar size districts and similar assessed valuation districts to determine the amount of effort that is being made by local citizens in comparison with citizens of other school districts throughout the state.

Profile II concerns district receipts and expenditures. The receipts are categorized by local receipts, county receipts, state receipts, federal receipts, non-revenue type receipts such as bond sales, and receipts from other districts in the form of tuition paid by other districts or special education services paid for by other districts. The chart indicates the percent of increase in the various types of receipts from one year to the next over the three-year time span. In conjunction with Profile I, which shows the change in ending balances as a percent of total expenditures, this comparison of change of receipts by type

of category over time will go a long way to explain why school districts are losing ground in their ending fund balances and thus their financial position.

The second major group of elements on district Profile II are the expenditures which are categorized according to USOE Handbook 2, Revised. This means in the categories of regular instruction, special instruction, compensatory education, vocational instruction, student activities, payments to other school districts for educational services, staff and pupil support services such as guidance counseling and library services and improvement of instruction services. Also we have general administration which would be the superintendent, building level administration. which would be the principal, operation of plant, pupil transportation, food services, facilities acquisition and construction, debt service, and, finally, community and adult education services. Missouri adopted USOE Handbook 2, Revised back as early as 1975-76. However, this adoption was on a staggered basis with not all school districts coming on to the system until fiscal year 1980-81. Thus, the profile that will be out this December will cover 1982-83, 1981--82, and 1980-81 all on the same reporting basis as far as expenditures are concerned. I thought that Missouri had a rather extraordinary turn around time in terms of putting out its state financial summary and publishing its school district profile by having them out in early December with a fiscal year close of June 30. However, I am now amazed by my compatriot here from Minneseota who has indicated to me that they can come up with these kinds of

statistics by the middle to end of August on the same fiscal year ending date.

The other significant feature of the expenditure section and one which I think all of us have dealt with from time to time, and perhaps even on a daily or weekly basis, is the cost per pupil figure. On this particular form it's labeled Current Expenditure per ADA or Average Daily Attendance. We follow the definition in USOE Handbook 2 which excludes capital outlay, it excludes facility acquisition, debt service, or community and adult education which are beyond the 12th grade. We have observed that current expenditures per ADA appear to be rising at a rate of about $200 per pupil per year.

The next significant feature of Profile II is the percent of receipts by category in the middle column, to total revenues. This is particularly significant when dealing with teachers' groups and when dealing with community members and tax payers who rant and rave about the ending fund balance in a district. Missouri has a fairly strong equalizing formula which means that a very poor district in Missouri might receive up to 80% of its total receipts from the State. On the other hand, a very wealthy district in the north part of Missouri might receive only 20 or 30 percent of its receipts from the State. This has tremendous implications for fund balance. State money is paid to school districts on a monthly basis, in essence in 12 equal installments. On the other hand, local receipts, if a district is property-wealthy, are collected once a year in January. This then means that the district who is receiving a high percentage of its income or revenue from local sources would have to carry a

much higher ending balance at June 30th in order to make it to the following January collections. Conversely, a very property-poor district who is receiving large amounts of state aid, receives these in equal installments every month and could thus carry a much smaller ending fund balance, relatively speaking, than the wealthy district. This then would be brought out by the percent of total receipts from the various sources on a per pupil basis which then can be compared with other districts on a per pupil basis.

One interesting aside concerning Missouri statistics; all of us have used Average Daily Attendance for years and years and all of us have used fall enrollment count of some type or another for some time. A great, large imbroglio occurred between the city districts, Kansas City, St. Louis, and the outstate rural districts, the last time the foundation program was revised in 1976-77. The large city districts wanted to use the enrollment counts for State Aid. The rural outstate districts wanted to use Average Daily Attendance counts for state aid. The reasons were fairly obvious. The outstate schools had 96% attendance and the urban districts were lucky if they had 84 to 87% attendance. The General Assembly or legislature, in its wisdom, satisfied both parties by adding together Average Daily Attendance and enrollment and dividing by two. The resulting concoction or statistic is euphemistically known as "eligible pupils". This note is put in to explain the per eligible pupil designation at the top of the District Profile II. You'll also note at the bottom of those columns that the current expenditure per eligible

pupil is somewhat smaller than the current expenditure per ADA simply because we are using a larger pupil divisor because we are including at least one-half weighted basis, the enrollment.

District Profile III (you'll need to turn the page) is a disp ay of relative transportation cost on a per-mile basis and on a per-average-daily-transported basis. This is useful in comparing your district with other similar size districts and other similar wealth districts in order to determine perhaps your level of service and the cost for that level of service. This particular schedule is going to be revised tremendously in 1982-83 to include our new efficiency factor. Missouri's transportation formula for years has operated on ADT and mile basis and a cost reimbursement basis. However, it was observed that districts with contracted operations were much more expensively operated and were at a much higher cost to the state than were district-owned operations. It was thought that a device would need to be put into the formula to limit reimbursements to districts with contracted operations so that the cost would not go "hog wild." At the same time, we couldn't put anything in that would be an obvious discrimination against contracted operations or we would get sued, thus the advent of the cost efficiency index.

The cost efficiency index matched like districts with like districts, such as those districts that had few kids, but travelled many, many miles such as rural outstate districts and those districts that had huge numbers of kids, but could pick them up in a relatively few number of miles. Thus, we were comparing apples with apples. These were plotted on an

extremely large graph and a best-fit curve was plotted between the points. The points being individual school districts' costs, if your costs were below this curve line, you'd have an efficiency index of less than 100%, if your costs were above this curve line, your efficiency index was above 100%. It was then written into law that if your cost index was greater than 105%, you would receive a penalty on your state aid. Rather large substantial penalties have resulted sometimes on the order of $200,000 and this has done amazing things for school districts conserving and becoming much sharper in dealing with their contractors and, in fact, even those district-owned operations that have rather high costs. The one thing that we cannot be accused of is matching up an urban district against a rural long route, sparsely populated district. That is because this technique matches like districts with like districts. If you are interested in receiving more information on this topic and particularly in receiving the new update profile, please write to me or to Dr. Bertha McClaskey. We should have this form ready sometime in December.

Turn to District Profile IV which is a combination of several diverse pieces of information, but which are asked for from time to time, particularly by community people, more of interest to the school district, perhaps than to the state education agency itself. The first item of information on this is graduate analysis, or what happens after leaving the school district to the people who have attended elementary and secondary education. This chart indicates the number of graduates, the

percent of people who are attending college, who are going to trade schools, those who go directly into employment, those who join the military and others. I think that this should have some bearing in analyzing if the statistic shows that virtually half or more of your people go directly into employment or go directly into trade schools. This then would cause me to go back to the expenditure schedule and see how much that district was spending on vocational education. If they were spending almost nothing on vocational education and yet had an extremely high number of graduates going directly into employment, then I would have a bone to pick with that school board.

District Profile IV also indicates the number of drop-outs experienced in the district. The district drop out can be related to School District Profile V which is on the next page, and on Profile V you get an idea of the total number of students enrolled in that school district in all grades and particularly you'd want to look at grades 9-12, see the total class size of grades 9-12 which, in this instance, appears to be well up over the 7,500 mark and then relate that to the number of drop-outs which appears to be 45 and then you'd have some sort of idea of the percent of drop-out experienced in grades 9-12 each year. These percents are expressed over on the right hand side of District Profile IV and we note a 1.8% drop out in 1981-82. This also takes into consideration the transfers in and the transfers out so that they do not effect or become part of the drop-out statistic itself.

On down toward the bottom of District Profile IV we find student mobility, which indicates the movement of students within

a district; in one extreme case that I am aware of in one of our Ozark counties near an interstate leading into St. Louis, the student mobility was approximately 45%. You can see in that particular instructional setting that continuity would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, and that articulation between grades would be almost impossible in that you might have an entirely different instructional strategy than a conventional school, if you had a student mobility rate of 45%. I might also add that in that particular district, the teacher turn-over rate was about 75%.

The next item of information on District Profile IV is the percent of AFDC students. These are the students that would be considered to be economically disadvantaged and, according to Title I, in all likelihood a fairly substantial number of these would also be educationally disadvantaged as measured by various achievement tests. You would be looking here to compare your district's percent of AFDC students with the State Profile, which we haven't gotten to yet. But, I think that you could readily understand that if this percent was up around 45% that you'd probably be looking at a district with some rather extreme educational disadvantagement and a district that would probably need some rather extensive compensatory education efforts.

Finally, at the bottom of the page of District Profile IV we find pupil-teacher ratio and we have been extremely careful to include in instructors only those people in the classroom. And we see here ratios of 20 to 1, these could then be compared with similar classifications school districts, AAA districts, similar

wealth districts and similar pupil-size districts. We then have below the instructors, which would be the classroom teachers, and the suport staff, which would be people like the librarians and guidance counselors and then these people summed and taken in relationship to the administration people which would be the superintendent, the assistant superintendents and building principals.

Now, one thing that has come up rather recently that we think that we're probably going to modify in the new school district profile, is on this particular table when we present it for 1982-83. We think we are going to add a line for pupil/regular teachers. One of the criticisms of our pupil-instructor ratio has been that it is artifically too low because it includes in the instructor category those instructors who are working with special education students where the ratios are extremely low, perhaps as low as 5 to 1 or 10 to 1 and instructors in vocational education where the ratios are also extremely low. So we're going to create a new line which will exclude at least those two classes and perhaps even exclude the teachers in compensatory education programs. We think by doing this that we will have a figure that will be much more acceptable as far as what you would find if you walked into a regular classroom on a given day.

District Profile V contains the actual enrollment for ungraded, kindergarten and grades 1-12 for the district over a three year actual time period and the projections for the next five years. The projection system that we have used is a combination of something that we received from New York State and

something that we received from Florida. Basically, it is a cohort survival method in which in the early going we used live births to predict kindergarten and one we've gotten kindergarten we observed actual cohort survival, actual enrollment in grades 1-12. We then use this in a statistical model and make our projections for future years. Amazingly enough, time has shown that our projections are extremely accurate. Indeed we have enough confidence now in these projections that we have extended this projection ability and are using these same technique in projecting average daily attendance into the future and projecting eligible pupils into the future. This then, for you state planners out there, helps us in using common statistics whenever we are talking to the General Assembly or legislature concerning amounts per pupil into the future on various state aid packages. It's nice for the various people within the state education agency to all use the same figure when they're talking to external parties who might later compare notes. As with many other states, Missouri has had a general decline in pupil population over the past several years in most districts.

However, there are a few notable exceptions where student numbers are gaining and this particular profile would be of very good use to those districts who have what you might call "hopes" progressing through their school grade level set-up. For instance, we might find an extremely large class in the third or fourth grades which would then have implication for the high school several years hence in terms of teacher staffing patterns

and so forth. It also would give ammunition to the school district if indeed there were increases down in the bottom grades in terms of facility planning for the junior high and senior high. On the other hand, if the district was declining sharply, and we did have one district that declined from 600 students to 400 students in the space of four years, this would have planning implications concerning the reduction in staff over that time span.

Now, let's turn to District Profile VI, which is one of the most interesting and probably one of the easiet ones to get into and relate to on a fairly understandable basis - that is the staff salary. Here we do something just a little bit differently. I said initially that there are six pages in the individual school district profile and tried to make the point that we hold this down just as tightly as possible in order not to inundate people with data and have the data be as meaningful as possible. You will note that on the page following Profile VI we have a Profile VI Supplement and this brings us right up to date. One of Missouri's data collecting features is the collection of staff information in September. This is turned around and included in this Profile which is published the very first days of December. Thus, when the school district receives their profile, they can compare their then current teachers' salaries with all other districts in the state.

We also have the regular profile here, the first District Profile VI, which shows the prior years' salaries. Thus, a very good trend line can be established as to what is happening on salaries for the district. The Profile shows the Classroom Teachers' Salaries at the top, Part A; Other Certificated Salaries, Part B would be your Guidance Counselors and Librarians and so forth; it shows the Administrators Salary, Part C; and the Total Certificated Staff which is the sum of A, B and C.

Of the greatest interest generally are the classroom teachers' salaries, and you will note that these were broken down by high school, junior high, and elementary so that some idea can be gained of the variation of salaries between these grade levels. Also, of even more importance, particularly as we appear to have an aging teaching staff, is the salaries by years of experience. Here, we have this categorized 0-5 years experience, 6-10 years experience, 11-15 years experience and greater than 15 years. Finally, the last division is where we have first-year instructors, or what is your beginning salary. In many cases, beginning salary doesn't mean anything anymore because no one is hiring any beginning teachers. I think I can illustrate this as we look at the state profiles in just a minute.

Then we have a division on here in which we indicate non-degree salaries, bachelor salaries, and master salaries. You will note that non-degree salaries are higher on the State Profile. This is because these are generally vocational people who receive certificates on the basis of their experience in industry . They are typically hired in Area Vocational Technical Schools, which typically are in larger urban areas, which also

have higher salaries than the rural outstate areas. This is the explanation that we use when we try to explain why these people without a degree earn more than bachelor degree people. The right hand column of District Profile VI indicates how many people that the district has in the high school, junior high, elementary, other certificated staff, the administrators, and in the total district. This will show you that we're hiring very few first-year instructors, particularly when we turn to the State Profile itself.

Finally, at the bottom is a rather ingenious little statistic which shows the average instructor's experience, and here we find the average instructor's experience is 14 yeras and you'll note that this is the next-to-top category in the years of experience breakdown, which will have later significance as we look at the State Profile itself. Finally, the last page is the Profile VI Supplement which is exactly the same thing as Profile VI, except that it brings your salaries up to the minute, to this very minute, and what the salaries are this year, realizing that this will be republished this coming December. The only thing that this lacks is the history, and of course, the history will be on the preceding page.

Now as an example of how to use this document, let us take our green State Profile Book and let us turn in the green State Profile Book to State Profile XVII Supplement. This will show us the average salary for 1983 and we may make a comparison between this particular page in the State Profile and this one district that we're looking at in the individual district profile. The first thing that we note is that the average salary in 1983 was $17,493 while our individual district profile here is above by

approximately $4,124. We'll note that the junior high average is above by $2,347. I might comment that junior highs are largely a creature of the urban, suburban district and this may skew the figure slightly in the upward mode, because they pay higher salaries regardless of grade level organization.

Next in this comparison between the State Profile and the District Profile, I think we have something extremely interesting developing here in the years of experience. You will note that our district starts out, if anything, about $1,100 higher in the early years of experience than does the State Profile average, and the 6-10 years experience range it gains ground by $2,000. Then, very significantly in the 11-15 year range, it gains ground to the tune of $4,200. This is significant because you will note at the bottom of the State Profile that the instructor average experience for the state is 14 years, which again puts it into the 11-15 year category. This, then, would make the state and the district similar in their positioning on some sort of master teacher salary schedule. So what this tells us is that this district hires people in a little above the state average and then they accelerate with years of experience. This is reinforced by looking at the first year instructor's category in which we noticed that bachelor's degree people are hired in this individual district at approximately $13,500 and the state averages in the $11,000 range. They also hired on a first year instructor with a master's degree at approximately $14,000 and the state average is around $13,000.

Another interesting fact that we can see in terms of the State Profile really has nothing to do with this individual district profile. The total number of first-year instructors is

1,600, or only 3.5% of the total classroom teachers. This has terrible implications for the state as a whole. You'll notice in the spread of "greater than 15 year teachers" that 30% of the teachers have greater than 15 years. We even have some districts where we look down at the instructor average experience and we find that the instructor average experience is 23 years. We also have a retirement system in which we have a "30 and out" provision, where if you have 30 years of experience you can retire with full benefits. I think when you put these things together you see in our state we are going to run up against a fairly serious problem within a fairly short period of time.

Number 1, we have no new people entering the profession as evidenced. Well not no one, but very few people entering the profession. Number 2, we have an increasingly aging teaching staff which very soon, relatively speaking, will each reach not a mandatory retirement age, but an age in which they could retire with full benefits. If, given teacher stress syndrome and some of the things we have heard about the lack of desireability of teaching as a profession and the pressures of the classroom, how many of them do you think will stick around once they have in 30 years and the option of getting out at full retirement pay? They'll quit and then what will the school district do? The answer in our state, as I'm sure the answer in your state, will be what we've done for years and that's water down and dilute, retrain and retread, bring a bunch of people in who are unqualified or poorly qualified, issue emergency certificates, use a lot of substitutes on 90 day permits, all the various devices that administrators use when they have to keep school open. They have to provide instruction. It's just that the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

instruction quality will suffer and we won't be putting out the product that we are even now being criticized for having a lower quality job than in the past, particularly in science and mathematics and I'm sure this will extend to other subjects as this teacher problem grows and grows, as we see here in this profile. I for one will be very anxious when the 1983-84 Supplement Profile comes out on staff and salary analysis, to see if this trend is continuing unabated as it appears in the more recent years. This will give great cause for concern to our State Board of Education and to the General Assembly.

Now as another example of relating the individual District Profile to the State Profile, let us turn our individual profile to Distric Profile II and our state profile to State Profile III, "Receipts and Expenditures Per Eligible Pupil by Enrollment Size." Remember that we can find district enrollment size by looking back at the pupil count data on District Profile V. In this instance, we see the district as somewhat over 21,000 pupils, so on the state profile that would put it in the range 15,000 and greater pupils. We now can compare this individual district with other districts in the same size range. For instance, we find that this district spent $1,362 per Eligible Pupil on regular instruction, whereas the state average in this size range was $1,242 per Eligible Pupil. We also find that the state average per Eligible Pupil was higher on special instruction, or Special Education. We find that it was also higher on compensatory education and that it was a lot lower on vocational instruction and a little lower on student activity expenditures. The district was significantly higher on staff and pupil support service expenditures and somewhat higher on

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

General Administration or Executive Administration. It was right on target on Building Level Administration and considerably higher on Operation and Maintenance of Plant. It was higher on Pupil Transportation and lower on Food Service costs.

I might take a bit of time here to explain how this comparison or why this comparison. First, the individual district that we are dealing with is in the eastern portion of the state. The size range that it finds itself in, 15,000 and greater, is predominantly suburban districts clustered around Kansas City and St. Louis. These then are in a totally different environment, as far as expenditures for salaries which are included in the state per pupil expense figures. A special school district overlaps this district and furnishes special education and vocational education services. However, this type of profile brings these types of items to light and begs for an explanation such as the explanation I've just given.

The next step in the analysis might be to turn the page in the State Profile book to "Receipts and Expenditures per Eligible Pupil by Assessed Valuation." In this way, we can find if any of these relationships change on the basis of whether the district that we're comparing would be a wealthy district or a poor district. We can find the wealth of the distirct, the individual district that is, by looking on District Profile I, in which case it's above $64,000 on an equalized basis. This would place it on the State Profile IV in the section $45,000 and greater or it would put it in at least the upper third of all districts. We find in this particular group of districts, that again our individual district here is far above the state average of districts with this type of wealth on instruction, regular

instruction money spent per pupil. We find that it is low on Special Education, largely because the districts with this type of wealth may belong or be encompassed within a Special District that you'll notice over on the left hand side of the State Profile. The compensatory education costs are lower than those you would find in the districts with greater than 445,000 assessed valuation per pupil, and the vocational costs are markedly lower than those found in other districts with similar wealth.

The explanation for this again, these particular districts with $45,000 per pupil and greater wealth tend to cluster around the Kansas City suburban area, and St. Louis suburban areas, and in the case of the St. Louis suburban areas, are members of the Special District which, in addition to teaching Special Education, also handles all vocational instruction in that area. Student activity expense is about the same as the state average for similar wealth districts. The pupil and staff support services are somewhat higher for this district than it is for other similar wealth districts. The general administration is lower for districts of similar wealth. In a similar manner, the building level administration or principals' offices are considerably lower than they are in similar wealth districts. Operation of Plant is, again, higher per pupil than similar wealth districts. However, transportation is lower than similar wealth districts, again, due to environment of this particular individual district at which we're looking. Food Service costs are lower, probably based in part upon transportation costs of getting it to this locale as opposed to the more rural locales. And, of course, finally, overall, expenditures per pupil or

current expenditure per pupil are $2,334 in the case of this individual district versus current expenditure per pupil of $2,488 for districts of similar wealth.

One of the interesting statistics concerning Missouri is that while we have 546 school districts in 1983-84 (we've lost one district to annexation in 1982-83) we have only 50 districts that pay the average teacher's salary. This unique statistic derives from the fact that relatively few school districts employ the vast bulk of all teachers in the state. Thus, if these relatively few districts, and these would be Kansas City, St. Louis and the suburban areas, pay relatively high salaries, then this tends to weight the average in a manner that is disconcerting in the rest of the state. For instance, Missouri recently passed a 1-cent sales tax strictly for education. One half is to go into increased expenditures and one half is to go for reduction in local property taxes. This influx of money was timed in such a manner as to perhaps encourage a 12%, maybe even as much as 15%, increase in teachers' salaries. We then find the outstate area increasing their salaries 12 or 15%, in which case it would mean an increase to the teacher of $1,300 to $1,800. At the same time, given the fact that this money was distributed simply on a flat grant per pupil basis, we find the cities giving the same type of raises, the same $1,300 to $1,800, yet in their case, the increase only amounted to 8%. So the differences here can largely be accounted for by the fact that the bases in the city areas were so much higher than the bases in the oustate area to which these increments were added.

This pretty well gives you the flavor of the State Profile and how it is to be compared to the District Profile. Again

notice that this can be done in any number of ways. It can be done according to similar wealth districts, similar size districts, similar classification in terms of AAA, AA and so forth, and finally, in terms of whether the district is a high school district, elementary district or if you're merely wishing to compare against composite state totals.

One of the more important things about this system is that there is no data input or data collection directly associated with this particular profile system. All the data are collected for other purposes and other reasons concerned with state aid to the schools, classification (evaluation) of the schools, and other routine activities of the Department of Education. Thus, there is no direct maintenance on the system of any extensive sort, it just kind of hums along on its own and the maintenance is done in the primary data collection areas. Thus, if changes are made in the financial data acquisition, these changes carry over automatically into the School Profile System. In a similar manner, if changes were made in the collection of information on teacher salaries, the courses that they teach, the number of hours, the number of days in the school year, these are automatically carried forward in the profile system. However, to review these changes and debate whether their inclusion would serve the school districts and would not just simply be more data for data sake. Such an example of this type of maintenance of the system would be the decision to add the pupil-instructor ratio that would be exclusively regular classroom teachers as opposed to Special Education teachers, Chapter 1 teachers and Vocational Education teachers.

The Missouri School Profile system has become a tool, an important tool, and one which is being used regularly by school superintendents, classroom teachers, teacher organizations, school boards and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. In fact, we are finding some interest by the General Assembly and other groups that deal in large policy matters as regards to the organization and operation of the public schools. We think that we have come up with something that works rather well and we would be happy to share this with any of you. If you have any questions, please fee free at the end of the session to turn these over to Mr. Tikkanen or myself.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE